

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILIN	G DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/791,194	03/0	2/2004	Frank L. Hall	4718.2US (00-0316.02/US)	1948
24247	7590	11/08/2005		EXAMINER	
TRASK BRI P.O. BOX 25:				HEINRICH, SAMUEL M	
SALT LAKE CITY, U		84110		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	ŕ			1725	

DATE MAILED: 11/08/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
		10/791,194	HALL, FRANK L.	•			
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
		Samuel M. Heinrich	1725				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence addres	is			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).							
Status							
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on						
·		action is non-final.					
3)□							
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposit	ion of Claims						
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) <u>1-6</u> is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>1-6</u> is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o						
Applicati	on Papers						
	The specification is objected to by the Examine	r					
10)⊠	The drawing(s) filed on <u>02 March 2004</u> is/are: Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	a) \square accepted or b) \square objected the drawing (s) be held in abeyance. Se ion is required if the drawing (s) is obtained.	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ojected to. See 37 CFR 1.	1 1			
Priority u	under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 							
2) Notic	t(s) te of References Cited (PTO-892) te of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)	4) ☐ Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) ☐ Notice of Informal F					
Pape	r No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:		,			

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1, 3, and 5 are not written using idiomatic language. For instance, claim 1, describes "scanning the substrate for irregularities for removal" is a run-on description which does not clearly describe the process. Merely repeatedly stating "for" does not provide adequate process description. \

Claims 2, 4, and 6 are not written using idiomatic language. For instance, claim 2 describes "roughening" and then defines the term as "removing contamination and foreign particles". It's not clear how removing contamination can roughen a surface.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by USPN 5,104,480 to Wojnarowski et al for the reasons as set forth in the last Office action.

Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by USPN 4,894,115 to Eichelberger et al for the reasons as set forth in the last Office action.

Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by USPN 5,504,303 to Nagy. See Figure 2 for a Prior Art description of surface measurement which occurs prior to ablation.

Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by USPN 5,711,698 to Chakraborty et al. Chakraborty et al describe (BSTX 8) laser ablating surface irregularities on a diamond surface. It is inherent that scanning of the surface for irregularities was performed at least one time in order to measure typical defect size.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed May 16, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that neither Wojnarowski et al nor Eichelberger et al describe "scanning the substrate for irregularities for removal". This argument is not convincing. Eichelberger et al describe cleaning particles from a laser scanned substrate and it is inherent that the particles were determined to be present through some process of scanning or viewing of the substrate. Wojnarowski et al describe (Summary of the Invention) forming an ablated pattern and it is inherent that some viewing or scanning was performed in order to determine where the pattern is to be formed.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The cited art pertains to inspection and ablation.

Application/Control Number: 10/791,194

Art Unit: 1725

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Samuel M. Heinrich whose telephone number is 571-

Page 4

272-1175. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas G. Dunn can be reached on 571-272-1171. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Samuel M Heinrich Primary Examiner

Art Unit 1725